

## REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated May 5, 2006, Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 9 and 13 stand objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of the rejections.

Applicants wish to impress upon the Examiner that the Greco reference does not teach or suggest the novel claims of the invention here presented. Specifically, while the present invention is generally characterized as a tool for extracting a connector, it is substantially different from and operates in a functionally different way than the cited reference that removes an IC. It is in this regard that Applicants are claiming a novel tool for a different function and not an old tool for the same function. Applicants believe that the claims do not read on the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants' *February 14, 2006 Remarks* are presented first for the Examiner's convenience before turning to the *Present Remarks* that clarify the novel invention in response to the Examiner's comments on Page 5 of the Final Office Action.

### February 14, 2006 Remarks

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Greco* (4,215,468). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a proper §102 rejection, each and every element of the claims must be found in the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that each and every element of the claims is not found in the *Greco* reference.

The present invention is directed to an extraction tool for an electrical connector. In certain devices such as CT machines and MRI machines, access into the devices is often limited. Service technicians must disconnect various connectors in order to service the device. The present invention provides a means for removing a connector. The present application includes other devices for disconnecting circuit boards and the like but are not subject to the present claims. The Examiner sets forth the *Greco* reference which is a device for disconnecting an integrated circuit rather than

a connector. As will be evident below, this is a different function that operates differently and does not include the limitations of the present claim.

With reference to Figs. 9-12 and the description in paragraphs 52-56, Claim 1 recites a tool 140 (para. 52, lines 1-3) for removing a first connector portion 22 having a retraction feature 52 (a better view of the retraction feature alone is set forth in Figure 3). The tool 140 includes a piston assembly 141 (para. 53, lines 1-4) having a sliding channel therethrough. The tool further includes a cross-member 156 (para. 53, lines 7-8) slidably receiving the piston assembly. The cross-member has a slot 162 (para. 53, line 10) therein. The cross-member 156 has a post head 158 sized to be received within the retraction feature 52. A pin 160 is positioned within the channel and is slidably received within the slot.

Claim 10 is also an independent claim which recites more detail with respect to the piston assembly 141 (para. 53, lines 1-4). Claim 10 recites a piston 142 having a handle 144 (para. 53, lines 2-3) disposed on the first end and a channel 146 disposed on the second end. Claim 10 further recites a grip 152 (para. 53, line 8) having an opening 150 therethrough for slidably receiving the piston 142 and a spring 148 located on the piston 142 between the handle 144 and the grip 152. The spring 148 urges the handle 144 away from the grip 152. A sleeve 154 (para. 53, line 6) is adjacent to the grip 152 for slidably receiving the piston 142. A cross-member 156 (para. 53, line 10) is adjacent to the sleeve 154. The cross-member 156 has a slot 162 therein. The cross-member 156 has a post head 158. The tool further comprises a pin 160 (para. 53, lines 8-11) positioned within the channel 146 and slidably received within the slot 162.

Applicants respectfully submit that a piston assembly and a cross-member slidably received within the piston assembly is not taught or suggested. However, Applicants respectfully submit that due to the function of the present invention, a substantial difference exists between Claim 1 and the *Greco* reference. Claim 1 recites "said cross-member having a post head sized to be received within the retraction feature." The retraction feature is a feature on the connector portion as recited in the preamble. The Examiner points to Fig. 7, reference numeral 20, for a post head. Applicants respectfully submit that no post head that is sized to be received within a retraction feature of a connector is taught or suggested. It appears that the reference

numeral 30 is merely a pin. The pin is better shown in Fig. 10. The pin is merely a single diameter pin that extends through the device upon which the slots 23 slide on. There is no post head on the pin and thus no post head is present that is sized to be received within a retraction feature. No teaching is found for engaging a retraction feature. This is not surprising because the *Greco* reference is for a substantially different purpose than that of the present application. The *Greco* reference is used for disconnecting an integrated circuit rather than a connector. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each and every element (the cross-member having a post head sized to be received within the retraction feature) is not taught or suggested in the *Greco* reference. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of Claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended to include that the post head is sized to be received within the retraction feature. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 10 is also allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

Applicants incorporate the previous response by reference herein. Applicants note that the reference numerals provided were to help the Examiner locate the various parts within the figures.

Claims 2-8 and 11-12 are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above since they further limit the independent claim.

#### **Present Remarks**


The Examiner states, "... the limitations of the claimed tool by numbering each of them in order to differentiate them from the prior art *Greco*... are not recited in the rejected claims...See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181(Fed. Cir. 1993)." Applicants agree with the Examiner's statement of the law that the limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. However, as indicated in bold above, Applicants only included the reference numerals to help the Examiner positively identify the limitations for each element thereby distinguishing the limitations of Applicants' invention from the prior art teachings of the *Greco* reference. In this regard, the **retraction feature of the connector is not part of the tool** as claimed and is only presented to give meaning to the claim in context of the scope of invention. However, the Examiner incorrectly

believes that the retraction feature is part of the tool as claimed and is emphasized by the Examiner's comment, "[A]pplicants urge that Greco does not teach the retraction feature, Greco does indeed teach the retraction feature of the tool as shown in Figures 1 to 2." Moreover, because the retraction feature of the connector is not part of the tool, the Examiner has failed to show how the pin 30 of the *Greco* reference can be received within the retraction feature. Further, the Examiner has failed to show the post head as required by the claims, as it is the post head that is receivable within a retraction feature of a connector that is to be removed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the arguments made on February 14 in light of today's comments and issue a notice of allowance because the *Greco* reference does not teach or suggest a cross-member having a post head sized to be received **within** the retraction feature as required by the claims.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By:   
R. Scott Vincent  
Reg. No. 55,771  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: May 23, 2006